

Remarks

Applicants appreciate the withdrawal of the prior rejections in consideration of Applicants' prior responses.

Applicants also appreciate the recognition of allowable subject matter in the present application. Applicants have made a minor amendment to claim 31 and respectfully submit amended claim 31 is allowable as set forth in the statement of reasons for allowance on page 6 of the Office Action.

Applicants hereby add new claims 48 and 49 which are supported at least by the teachings in Figs. 3-5 and 7 and the associated teachings of the specification.

Claims 1-7, 9-12, 14, 15, 17-20, 22-27, 33-38, and 40-47 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) for anticipation by U.S. Patent No. 6,198,497 to Luque. Claims 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) for anticipation by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0024586 A1 to Nakatsuka. Claims 8, 21 and 28 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) for obviousness over Luque in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,986,687 to Hori.

Referring to the rejection of independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that positively-recited limitations of the claims are not disclosed nor suggested by the teachings of Luque and the rejection is in error.

Claim 1 explicitly recites *a start-of-scan detector assembly configured to sample the single light beam and initiate a start-of-scan operation of one of the scan lines of information to be written on the photoconductor, and wherein only the sampled single light beam is used to control a drive level of the light source.*

The Office relies upon the teachings of Fig. 6 as allegedly teaching the claimed start-of scan detector assembly. To the contrary of teaching the claimed start-of-scan assembly, Fig. 6 teaches an adjustment circuit. Furthermore, *Luque is void of any teaching that the adjustment circuit of Fig. 6 operates as a start-of-scan detector assembly which is configured to initiate a start-of-scan operations of one of the scan lines of information to be written on the photoconductor.* Applicants have electronically searched the entirety of Luque and have failed to identify any teachings regarding a start-of-scan assembly let alone the start-of-scan assembly as explicitly claimed.

The Office refers to col. 9, lines 9+ of Luque in support of the position that the adjustment circuit of Fig. 6 operates as a start-of-scan assembly. To the

contrary of supporting the interpretation by the Office, the teachings of col. 9, lines 9+ illustrate why the adjustment circuit may not be fairly interpreted to disclose the start-of-scan detector assembly as claimed. Col. 9 teaches that the video signal is only applied while binary data is sent to the diode and the video signal is not present during the adjustment process of Fig. 6. Referring to the explicit teachings of col. 13, lines 15+, it is clear that the adjustment process of Fig. 6 is implemented between scans when the sampled light beam is not directed to the photoconductor. Accordingly, the adjustment process of Luque is merely implemented between scans upon the photoconductor and Applicants have failed to identify any teachings that the adjustment circuit operates as the claimed start-of-scan detector assembly configured to sample the single light beam and initiate a start-of-scan operation of one of the scan lines of information to be written on the photoconductor. The adjustment process of Luque is merely used to control output of the diode with no teachings of operation to initiate start-of-scan operations of one of the scan lines of information as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that positively-recited limitations of the claims are not disclosed nor suggested by the prior art and the prior art rejection is in error for at least this reason.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the prior art rejection in the next Action.

Referring to independent claim 9, *a laser scanning apparatus comprises a rotating scanning device configured to scan a light beam from a light source and a photodetector optically coupled with the rotating scanning device and configured to sample the light beam from the rotating scanning device*.

At page 3 of the Office Action, the Office fails to identify any teachings of the claimed photodetector. Luque does teach a photodetector 35 in Fig. 6. However, Applicants have failed to uncover any teachings in Luque that the photodetector 35 samples a light beam from a rotating scanning device which fails to teach or suggest that the *photodetector is optically coupled with the rotating scanning device and configured to sample the light beam from the rotating scanning device* as explicitly claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that positively-recited limitations of the claims are not disclosed nor suggested by the prior art and the prior art rejection is in error

for at least this reason.

Claim 9 also recites that the *control system is configured to maintain the light source at a constant drive level during scanning of a single line of information on the photoconductor*. The Office identifies the adjustment circuit of Fig. 6 of Luque as teaching the control system. The teachings in col. 3, lines 4-6 and col. 6, lines 57-62 of Luque are void any disclosure or suggestion that the adjustment circuitry teaches the claimed combination of limitations that the *control system is configured to maintain the light source at a constant drive level during scanning of a single line of information on the photoconductor*. Furthermore, Luque explicitly teaches that the adjustment circuitry operations are implemented when the *scanning upon the photoconductor does not occur* per col. 9, lines 9+ and col. 13, lines 15+.

Applicants respectfully submit that positively-recited limitations of the claims are not disclosed nor suggested by the prior art and the prior art rejection is in error for at least this reason.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the prior art rejection in the next Action.

Referring to independent claim 14, Luque fails to teach that the photodetector 35 of the adjustment circuitry of Fig. 6 is optically coupled with a scanning device which fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination of limitations of the *scanning device configured to scan the single light beam from the laser and a photodetector optically coupled with the scanning device*.

Applicants respectfully submit that positively-recited limitations of the claims are not disclosed nor suggested by the prior art and the prior art rejection is in error for at least this reason.

Furthermore, Luque explicitly discloses in cols. 9 and 13 that the adjustment operations of the adjustment circuitry of Luque occur when a line is not being scanned upon a photoconductor which fails to teach or suggest the claimed *photodetector configured to sample the single light beam only once per line of information scanned onto a photoconductor*.

Applicants respectfully submit that positively-recited limitations of the claims are not disclosed nor suggested by the prior art and the prior art rejection is in error for at least this reason.

As discussed above, the adjustment circuit of Luque operates when a line is not being scanned upon a photoconductor which fails to teach or suggest the claimed *control system configured to receive an indication of the sampled single light beam from the photodetector and to maintain a drive level of the laser at a constant drive level during scanning of the line of information onto the photoconductor using the indication of the sampled single light beam.*

Applicants respectfully submit that positively-recited limitations of the claims are not disclosed nor suggested by the prior art and the prior art rejection is in error for at least this reason.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the prior art rejection in the next Action.

Referring to independent claim 18, the adjustment circuit including the photodetector 35 of Luque operates when data is not scanned upon the photoconductor which fails to teach or suggest the claimed *means for scanning the single light beam onto a photoconductor and means for sampling the single light beam which causes information to be scanned onto the photoconductor.*

Applicants respectfully submit that positively-recited limitations of the claims are not disclosed nor suggested by the prior art and the prior art rejection is in error for at least this reason.

The teachings of Luque also fail to disclose the positively-claimed limitations of the *means for receiving an indication of the sampled single light beam from the means for sampling and for maintaining the means for generating at a constant drive level using the indication of the sampled single light beam and during scanning of the line of information onto the photoconductor.*

Applicants respectfully submit that positively-recited limitations of the claims are not disclosed nor suggested by the prior art and the prior art rejection is in error for at least this reason.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the prior art rejection in the next Action.

Referring to independent claim 22, the photodetector 35 arrangements of Fig. 6 of Luque fail to teach the combination of *scanning the single light beam along the photoconductor using the rotating scanning device and sampling only the single light beam from the rotating scanning device using a sampling assembly.*

Applicants respectfully submit that positively-recited limitations of the claims are not disclosed nor suggested by the prior art and the prior art rejection is in error for at least this reason.

The adjustment circuitry of Luque is implemented during periods of time when information is not written on the photoconductor and the Office has failed to identify any teachings of the claimed limitations of *maintaining an output power of the light source at a constant level during writing of a single scan line of information onto the photoconductor.*

Applicants respectfully submit that positively-recited limitations of the claims are not disclosed nor suggested by the prior art and the prior art rejection is in error for at least this reason.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the prior art rejection in the next Action.

Referring to independent claim 29, the device recites *a control system configured to control an intensity of the single light beam generated by the laser to be substantially constant during scanning of a line of information upon the photoconductor using the signal indicative of the sampling of the single light beam.* The teachings of Fig. 2 and paragraphs 0068-0072 of Nakatsuka are void of the claimed control system configured to control the intensity of the single light beam to be substantially constant during scanning of a line of information. To the contrary, these teachings disclose a light output power P_N of a plurality of laser power levels for multiple density printing. In addition, paragraph 0067 teaches the *driving current of the laser is controlled by a varying power level data signal so that printing dots of different sizes may be implemented* which fails to disclose the claimed limitations and teaches away from the above-recited limitations.

Applicants respectfully submit that positively-recited limitations of the claims are not disclosed nor suggested by the prior art and the prior art rejection is in error for at least this reason.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the prior art rejection in the next Action.

Referring to dependent claim 44, the Office indicates on page 3 of the Office Action that such claim is allegedly anticipated by Luque. Applicants respectfully submit this rejection is in error since claim 44 depends from claim 29 which was

not rejected over Luque.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the prior art rejection in the next Action.

The claims which depend from the independent claims are in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above with respect to the respective independent claims as well as for their own respective features which are neither shown nor suggested by the cited art.

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims.

The Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned if the Examiner believes such would facilitate prosecution of the present application. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time during normal business hours (Pacific Time Zone).

Respectfully submitted,
William D. Holland

By: /James D. Shaurette/
James D. Shaurette
Reg. No. 39,833
Date: June 30, 2009
(509) 624-4276